

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached replacement sheet(s) of drawings includes changes to Figs. 5-12. These sheets, which include Figs. 4-12, replace the original sheets including those same Figures.

Fig. 5-12 have been corrected to provide reference numerals and lead lines as noted in the Office Action.

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-8 and 15 are now present in this application, of which claims 1 and 15 are independent. By this amendment, the specification and abstract have been amended, the drawings have been corrected, and claims 1 and 15 have been amended.

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Information Disclosure Citation

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the references identified in the Information Disclosure Statement filed December 16, 2005, and for providing Applicants with an initialed copy of the PTO-SB08 form filed therewith.

Objection to the Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because Figures 5-12 are not clearly understood. In particular, the Examiner noted that the lines are not clear, clean, or crisp. The Examiner also noted that there are no labels or lead lines to readily understand the drawings.

In order to overcome this objection, Applicants are concurrently submitting Replacement Drawing Sheets for the Examiner's approval, which address each of the deficiencies pointed out by the Examiner. Applicants note that the specification has been amended to include the labels added to Figures 5-12. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Objection to the Abstract of the Disclosure

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract of the Disclosure because of the use of legal phraseology and was not limited to a single paragraph.

In order to overcome this objection, Applicants have amended the Abstract of the Disclosure. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are respectfully requested.

Specification Amendments

Applicants have amended the specification to include the reference numerals added to Figures 5-12.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 1-8 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language lacks antecedent basis or is not clearly understood.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 15 to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-8 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,541,585 to Duhamel et al. ("Duhamel"). Further, claims 1-8 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,042,492 to Spinelli. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 has been amended to recite a combination of elements in a sensor arrangement for controlling opening and closing of a door device, the sensor arrangement being arranged to be mounted in a vicinity of the door device, the sensor arrangement including "an image-acquiring means, which is arranged to be mounted in a viewing position wherein said image-acquiring means monitors a field of view that encompasses at least an approach area located adjacent said door device, said image-acquiring means being adapted to acquire images of said field of view," "a movement detector, which is arranged to receive said acquired images and which is arranged to process the received images in order to detect a movement, which is to result in an opening of the door device," and "an event generator, which is arranged to receive information regarding

said door device and said field of view, said information comprising said acquired images, said event generator being arranged to process said information in order to identify at least one event according to predetermined criteria, said at least one event pertaining to exceptional situations excluded from normal operation of said sensor arrangement, wherein the event generator in response to an identification of an event creates a recording of the event.” Independent claim 15 has been similarly amended.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of elements as set forth in independent claims 1 and 15 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Duhamel and Spinelli.

Duhamel relates to a security system for controlling access of people through a controlled portal. A presence detector senses the presence of an object within an approach zone located substantially adjacent the portal. When an object is detected, a fixed transceiver automatically transmits an interrogation signal into the approach zone. A portable transceiver carried by the person seeking access to the portal responds to the interrogation signal by transmitting a response signal. See abstract.

Spinelli relates to an automatic door assembly for installation at a doorway. The door controlling system includes a video imaging device mounted in a viewing position monitoring a field of view that encompasses an approach area located adjacent to the doorway. The processor receives an internal video data signal from the imaging device and processes the information comprising the internal video data signal to determine whether a person or object has entered the approach area. The detection system transmits a door opening signal in response to the processor thereof determining that a person or object has entered the approach area. The door assembly also comprises a door operator connected to the door panel and communicated with the detection system. The door operator moves the door panel from the closed position thereof to the open position thereof responsive to receiving the door opening signal. See abstract.

As set forth above, independent claim 1 is directed to a sensor arrangement for controlling opening and closing of a door device. The sensor arrangement is arranged to be mounted in the vicinity of the door device. The sensor arrangement comprises an image-acquiring means adapted to acquire images of a field of view and a movement detector, which is arranged to receive the acquired images and which is arranged to process the received images in order to detect a movement, resulting in an opening of the door device.

The sensor arrangement of claim 1 further includes an event generator, which is arranged to receive information regarding the door device and the field of view, the information includes the acquired images. The event generator is arranged to process the information in order to identify at least one event according to predetermined criteria, wherein the event generator in response to an identification of an event creates a recording of the event. The event according to predetermined criteria pertains to exceptional situations that are excluded from normal operations of the sensor arrangement.

Applicants disclose that the sensor arrangement relates to handling of dangerous or exceptional situations in a specific manner and that information of normal, uninteresting situations may be discarded. In other words, the claimed events relate to events pertaining to exceptional situations excluded from normal operation of the sensor arrangement (as defined by the door device and the field of view). See page 4, lines 10-17 and page 12, lines 20-23 of the present application. Table 1 lists examples of 11 events that may occur. The events are characterized by relating to events excluded from normal operation of the access system which the sensor arrangement including the event generator is arranged to monitor. In other words, the events recorded by the event generator is, in contrast to prior art, not related to events associated with normal operation of the access system, such as events pertaining to, during normal hours of operation, opening/closing the door in response to a user being granted access through a monitored door of the access system.

Furthermore, as described by Applicants in the present application, the recording of an event by the event generator will notify personnel and provide useful information about the sensor unit or the door device environment. See page 15, lines 3-23.

Because the Examiner alleges that independent claims 1 and 15 are "clearly anticipated" by Duhome and Spinelli, without further explanation, Applicants assume that the Examiner believes that the functionality of the fixed transceiver of Duhome and the processor of Spinelli correspond to the event generator set forth in claims 1 and 15. If this assumption is incorrect, Applicants respectfully request further explanation as to how Duhome and Spinelli are believed to anticipate the independent claims. Assuming that Applicants understanding is correct, neither the functionality of the fixed transceiver of Duhome nor the processor of Spinelli discloses the claimed event generator.

Duhamé

Duhamé teaches a programmable timer connected to the fixed transceiver and controlling access to the building depending on the time of day and the identification code received from the portable transceiver. Thereby certain portable transceiver identification codes may unlock the door at certain times of the day but leave the door locked at other times of the day. See col. 2, ll. 52-57. The door is controlled by an electromechanical door lock mechanism which in response to receiving a valid response code from the fixed transceiver is activated to unlock the door. See col. 5, ll. 5-9. Consequently, Duhamé relates to normal operation procedures of the access system. In particular, Duhamé does not disclose that the fixed transceiver acts as an event generator capable of identifying events according to predetermined criteria including those relating to events excluded from normal operation of the access system and subsequently storing the event.

While Duhamé teaches various systems to store, decode and verify the identification code transmitted by a portable transceiver, the process to store, decode and verify identification codes are neither related nor comparable to the claimed invention set forth in independent claims 1 and 15.

Furthermore, although the fixed transceiver may be connected to other electronic devices and remote monitoring facilities using a communication link (see Duhamé at column 3 lines 7-9), none of these electronic devices correspond to the claimed event generator.

For the foregoing reasons, Duhamé cannot anticipate independent claims 1 and 15, as amended.

Spinelli

Spinelli discloses a processor to receive internal video data signal from the imaging device and to process the information comprising the internal video data signal to determine whether a person or object has entered the approach area. See col. 2, ll. 27-31. The video data may then be stored in a video data storing device. See col. 2, l. 66 to col. 3, l. 3; col. 6, ll. 35-36; and col. 8, ll. 28-30. However, Spinelli fails to disclose storage of particular events, as required by independent claims 1 and 15.

In terms of events excluded from normal operation procedures, Spinelli discloses a learn mode of the processor during which the field of view is learned in the sense that background

images are stored in a look-up table, thus permitting later comparison to determine significant changes to the background image during normal door operation. See col. 12, ll. 18-24. Spinelli refers to this as "presence" sensing. However, identifying changes to the background image, as disclosed by Spinelli, is different from changing the background image, as disclosed by the present application. The former relates to external objects entering in front of the objects forming the background image, such as a person entering the area monitored by the camera and thereby at least partly covering the objects forming the background image, which would be a normal event. The latter relates to changes in the background image itself, such as the background image being tilted, shifted, or otherwise changed, which would be an exception situation.

Therefore, Spinelli cannot anticipate independent claims 1 and 15, as amended. Furthermore, because both Duhamel and Spinelli suffer from the same type of defect, any hypothetical combination of Duhamel and Spinelli would fail to render independent claims 1 and 15 obvious.

Applicants respectfully submit that the combinations of elements as set forth in independent claim 1 and 14 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Duhamel and Spinelli, for the reasons explained above. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 2-8, Applicants submit that claims 2-8 depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, which is allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore claims 2-8 are allowable based on their dependence from claim 1. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Additional Cited References

Since the remaining references cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject the claims, but have merely been cited to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and

complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.


In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Chad D. Wells, Registration No. 50,875 at the telephone number of the undersigned below to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Director is hereby authorized to charge any fees required during the pendency of the above-identified application or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448.

Dated: December 24, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road, Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

703-205-8000

CDW

Attachments

Replacement Sheets including Figures 4-12